

**Critical properties of the transition between the Haldane phase and
the large- D phase of the spin-1/2 ferromagnetic-antiferromagnetic
Heisenberg chain with on-site anisotropy**

Kiyomi Okamoto[†]

Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology,
Oh-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152, Japan

(Received 1995)

Abstract. We analytically study the ground-state quantum phase transition between the Haldane phase and the large- D (LD) phase of the $S = 1/2$ ferromagnetic-antiferromagnetic alternating Heisenberg chain with on-site anisotropy. We transform this model into a generalized version of the alternating antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model with anisotropy. In the transformed model, the competition between the transverse and longitudinal bond alternations yields the Haldane-LD transition. Using the bosonization method, we show that the critical exponents vary continuously on the Haldane-LD boundary. Our scaling relations between critical exponents very well explains the numerical results by Hida.

PACS number: 75.10.Jm, 75.30.Kz, 05.70.Jk

[†] E-mail address: kokamoto@stat.phys.titech.ac.jp

§1. Introduction

Since Haldane's prediction[1,2], the integer spin chains have been attracting much attention. Hida [3,4] tried to elucidate the properties of the spin-1 Heisenberg chain from the standpoint of the spin-1/2 ferromagnetic-antiferromagnetic alternating chain. He considered the Hamiltonian [4]

$$\mathcal{H}_D = 2J \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{2j} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2j+1} + 2J' \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{2j-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2j} + D \sum_{j=1}^N (S_{2j-1}^z + S_{2j}^z)^2, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_j$ is the spin-1/2 operator. We assume that $J > 0$ (antiferromagnetic) and $J' < 0$ (ferromagnetic) and we are interested in only the ground-state. Hereafter we call the model (1.1) “ D -model” following Hida [5].

In the case of $J' \rightarrow -\infty$, where the spins $\mathbf{S}_{2j-1}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{2j}$ form a triplet, the model (1.1) reduces to a spin-1 antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain with on-site anisotropy:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_D^{S=1} = \frac{J}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{S}}_j \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{j+1} + D \sum_{j=1}^N (\hat{S}_j^z)^2, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_j = \mathbf{S}_{2j-1} + \mathbf{S}_{2j}$ is the spin-1 operator. When $J' = D = 0$, on the other hand, Hamiltonian (1.1) reduces to the two-spin problem. Its ground-state is the complete dimer state in which the spins $\mathbf{S}_{2j}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{2j+1}$ form a singlet pair $(1/\sqrt{2})(\uparrow_{2j}\downarrow_{2j+1} - \downarrow_{2j}\uparrow_{2j+1})$. When $D = 0$, therefore, Hamiltonian (1.1) smoothly connects the dimer state of the spin-1/2 chain and the Haldane state of the spin-1 chain.

Hida [3] numerically diagonalized the finite system of Hamiltonian (1.1) in the $D = 0$ case to find that there is no evidence for the phase transition of the ground-state between $J' = 0$ and $J' = -\infty$. Therefore he concluded that the Haldane phase of the spin-1 chain can be interpreted as the special case of the dimer phase of the spin-1/2 chain. This picture was supported by the work of Kohmoto and Tasaki [6], and Takada [7] who used the nonlocal unitary transformation. Hida [4] also performed the numerical diagonalization for the $D \neq 0$ case to draw the phase diagram of the D -model on the $J' - D$ plane. He found the Haldane phase, the large- D (LD) phase, the Néel I phase and the Néel II phase. The Néel I state is the usual Néel state of the spin-1/2 chain, whereas the Néel II state is like the $|\cdots \uparrow_{2j-1} \uparrow_{2j} \downarrow_{2j+1} \downarrow_{2j+2} \cdots\rangle$ state which becomes the usual Néel state of the spin-1 chain in the limit of $J' \rightarrow -\infty$. Hida [8] also numerically estimated the critical exponents the Haldane-LD boundary.

Yamanaka, Hatsugai and Kohmoto [9] investigated the model

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\lambda = & 2J \sum_{j=1}^N (S_{2j}^x S_{2j+1}^x + S_{2j}^y S_{2j+1}^y + \lambda S_{2j}^z S_{2j+1}^z) \\ & + 2J' \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{S}_{2j-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2j}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where the parameter λ represents the interaction anisotropy of the antiferromagnetic bonds. We call this model “ λ -model”. This model is equivalent to the spin-1 XXZ model

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\lambda^{S=1} = \frac{J}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (\hat{S}_j^x \hat{S}_{j+1}^x + \hat{S}_j^y \hat{S}_{j+1}^y + \lambda \hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_{j+1}^z), \quad (1.4)$$

in the limit of $J' \rightarrow -\infty$. We note that the ferromagnetic bonds should be isotropic so that $\mathbf{S}_{2j}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{2j+1}$ form a triplet pair when $J' \rightarrow -\infty$. They mapped this model onto the highly anisotropic version of the two-dimensional Ashkin-Teller model and performed the “high temperature expansion” to obtain the ground-state phase diagram. Their phase diagram consists of several phases, including the Haldane phase, the Néel phase and the XY phase. Hida [5] also drew the phase diagram of the λ -model by mapping the λ -model onto the D -model. His conclusion was consistent with that of Yamanaka et al.[9].

Okamoto, Nishino and Saika [10] have shown that the Haldane-LD boundary of Hida's phase diagram (obtained by the numerical calculations) for the D -model can be semi-quantitatively reproduced by an

analytical method. In this paper, we proceed their work to investigate the critical properties of the Haldane-LD transition. We show that the Haldane-LD transition is of the Gaussian universality class and the critical exponents vary continuously on the boundary. In §2, we explain the nature of the Haldane-LD transition. In §3 the bosonization approach to the Haldane-LD transition given and the critical properties are discussed. The last section §4 is devoted to discussion.

§2. Nature of the Haldane-LD transition

In the following we investigate Hamiltonian (1.1) assuming $J' < 0$. Performing the spin rotation around the z -axis,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_j^x &= -S_j^x, & \tilde{S}_j^y &= -S_j^y, & \tilde{S}_j^z &= S_j^z, & \text{for } j = 4l, 4l+1, \\ \tilde{S}_j^x &= S_j^x, & \tilde{S}_j^y &= S_j^y, & \tilde{S}_j^z &= S_j^z, & \text{otherwise,} \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

we can transform Hamiltonian (1.1) into an antiferromagnetic form [4]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{H}} &= 2J_0 \sum_{j=1}^{2N} \{ (\tilde{S}_j^x \tilde{S}_{j+1}^x + \tilde{S}_j^y \tilde{S}_{j+1}^y + \Delta \tilde{S}_j^z \tilde{S}_{j+1}^z) \\ &\quad + (-1)^j [\delta_{\perp} (\tilde{S}_j^x \tilde{S}_{j+1}^x + \tilde{S}_j^y \tilde{S}_{j+1}^y) + \delta_z \tilde{S}_j^z \tilde{S}_{j+1}^z] \} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_0 &= \frac{J(1 + |\tilde{J}'|)}{2}, & \Delta &= 1 + \frac{\tilde{D} - 2|\tilde{J}'|}{1 + |\tilde{J}'|}, \\ \delta_{\perp} &= \frac{1 - |\tilde{J}'|}{1 + |\tilde{J}'|}, & \delta_z &= \frac{1 - |\tilde{J}'| - (\tilde{D} - 2|\tilde{J}'|)}{1 + |\tilde{J}'|}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\tilde{J}' \equiv J'/J, \quad \tilde{D} \equiv D/J. \quad (2.4)$$

Hamiltonian (2.3) can be interpreted as a generalized version of the alternating antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain with anisotropy (see Fig.1). The point $(|\tilde{J}'|, \tilde{D}) = (1, 2)$ (called S point) is the solvable point where Hamiltonian (2.2) represents the uniform and isotropic antiferromagnetic chain. The S point is the tricritical point of the Haldane phase, LD phase and the Néel phase in Hida's phase diagram [4].

In the bosonization theory of the bond alternation problem, it has long been considered that the δ_z term plays an irrelevant role. However, we have recently pointed out that the ground-state of Hamiltonian (2.2) in the case of $\delta_{\perp} = 0$ and $\delta_z > 0$ is the dimer state [11,12]. This shows the importance of the δ_z term, because the ground-state would be the spin-fluid state if the δ_z term played an irrelevant role. When $\Delta = 1$ and $\delta_{\perp} = \delta_z = 1$, the ground-state of Hamiltonian (2.3) is the complete dimer state (an array of local singlet dimers), and both the δ_z term and the $\delta_{\perp}$ term give the same contribution to the excitation gap apart from a factor 2. Then, in $\Delta = 1$ and $\delta_{\perp} = \delta_z > 0$ case where the ground-state is the dimer state, we expect that the excitation gap should behave as

$$\epsilon_{\text{gap}} \sim (2\delta_{\perp} + \delta_z)^{\nu}, \quad (2.5)$$

due to the SU(2) symmetry. Here ν is the exponent of the correlation length and we do not enter into the logarithmic correction problem [13]. Thus we can consider that the $\delta_{\perp}$ term and the δ_z term are mutually cooperative when $\delta_{\perp}\delta_z > 0$, and competing when $\delta_{\perp}\delta_z < 0$. Of course, when $\Delta \neq 1$, equation (2.5) itself may be no longer valid.

Let us consider the $\Delta < 1$ case, where we can exclude the possibility of the Néel state. When $\delta_{\perp} > 0$ and $\delta_z > 0$, an effective singlet dimer is formed by spins $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{2j}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{2j+1}$. Their coupling is antiferromagnetic in the original spin ($\mathbf{S}$) representation before the transformation (2.1). Since this singlet dimer is still a singlet dimer in the $\mathbf{S}$ representation, this state is the Haldane state. On the other hand, when $\delta_{\perp} < 0$ and $\delta_z < 0$, spins $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{2j-1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{2j}$ (their coupling is ferromagnetic in the $\mathbf{S}$ representation) form an effective singlet pair. By the transformation (2.1), this singlet dimer is transformed into the triplet dimer (like $(1/\sqrt{2})(\uparrow_{2j-1}\downarrow_{2j} + \downarrow_{2j-1}\uparrow_{2j})$ state) in the $\mathbf{S}$ representation. This is the $\hat{S}^z = 0$ state of the spin with $\hat{S} = 1$. Therefore this state is nothing but the LD state. We note that, in the $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$ representation, both the Haldane

state and the LD state are the singlet dimer state, but the dimer configuration is different by one spin site between these two states.

What happens in the region where $\delta_{\perp} < 0$ and $\delta_z > 0$? If the effect of δ_z ($\delta_{\perp}$) is predominant, the ground-state may be the Haldane (LD) state. Therefore the ground-state phase transition between the Haldane state and the LD state can be observed in this region. The Haldane-LD phase boundary may be determined by the line on which the effects of $\delta_{\perp}$ and δ_z cancel out with each other. From equation (2.5), the simplest estimation for the Haldane-LD boundary may be

$$2\delta_{\perp} + \delta_z = 0 , \tag{2.6}$$

which results in

$$\tilde{D} = 2|\tilde{J}'| . \tag{2.7}$$

Although this estimation is too rough because equation (2.5) may be valid only when $\Delta = 1$, the nature of the Haldane-LD transition is well explained by the above mentioned picture. More elaborate estimation will be given in the next section.

§3. Critical properties of the Haldane-LD transition

Through a careful bosonization procedure, we can map Hamiltonian (2.2) onto a generalized version of the sine-Gordon Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b = 2J_0 \int dx \{ A(\nabla\theta)^2 + CP^2 + B_I \cos 2\theta - B_\perp \cos \theta - B_z (\nabla\theta)^2 \cos \theta \} , \quad (3.1)$$

where the commutation relation

$$[\theta(x), P(x')] = i\delta(x - x') , \quad (3.2)$$

holds. The coefficients $B_\perp$, B_z and B_I are obtained directly from the bosonization procedure as

$$B_\perp = \frac{\delta_\perp}{a} , \quad B_z = \frac{\delta_z a}{\pi} , \quad B_I = \frac{\Delta}{2a} , \quad (3.3)$$

where a is the spin spacing. These expressions are considered to be valid when $\delta_\perp \ll 1$, $\delta_z \ll 1$, $\Delta \ll 1$. Similar expressions were already obtained by Nakano and Fukuyama [14], but there was an error in the sign in their expressions. In their expressions, the $B_\perp$ term and the B_z term are mutually competing when $\delta_\perp \delta_z > 0$. From the discussion of §2, these terms should be mutually cooperative when $\delta_\perp \delta_z > 0$, as is realized in (3.1).

Since the term $B_I \cos 2\theta$ is irrelevant for the $\Delta < 1$ case with which we are concerned, we may neglect this term by setting

$$B_I = 0 . \quad (3.4)$$

For the coefficients A and C , the bosonization procedure leads to

$$A = \frac{a}{8\pi} \left(1 + \frac{3\Delta}{\pi} \right) , \quad C = 2\pi a \left(1 - \frac{\Delta}{\pi} \right) . \quad (3.5)$$

Of course, these expressions may be valid for $\Delta \ll 1$. Therefore we cannot use such expressions, because we require expressions valid near $\Delta = 1$ to discuss the Haldane-LD transition near the S point ($\Delta = 1$, $\delta_\perp = \delta_z = 0$). When $\delta_\perp = \delta_z = 0$, Hamiltonian (2.2) represents the uniform XXZ chain for which the exact results are available. In this case, the spin wave velocity v [15], and the power decay exponent η [16], defined by $(-1)^r \langle S_0^z S_r^z \rangle \sim r^{-\eta}$, are

$$\frac{v}{2J_0} = \frac{\pi a \sqrt{1 - \Delta^2}}{2 \cos^{-1} \Delta} , \quad (3.6)$$

$$\eta = \frac{2}{1 + (\pi/2) \sin^{-1} \Delta} , \quad (3.7)$$

respectively. If we use the bosonized Hamiltonian (3.1) with $B_I = B_\perp = B_z = 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{v}{2J_0} = 2\sqrt{AC} , \quad \eta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{C}{A}} . \quad (3.8)$$

From equations (3.6)-(3.8) we can immediately write down the expressions for A and C . This procedure for the adjustment of the coefficients was first proposed by Cross and Fisher [17] and applied by Nakano and Fukuyama [14,18]. If we expand A and C with respect to $\epsilon \equiv 1 - \Delta$, we obtain

$$\frac{v}{2J_0} = \frac{\pi a}{2} + O(\epsilon) , \quad \eta = 1 + \frac{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}{\pi} , \quad (3.9)$$

$$A = \frac{a}{8} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}{\pi} \right) , \quad C = \frac{\pi^2 a}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}{\pi} \right) . \quad (3.10)$$

up to the lowest order of ϵ . Expressions (3.9) and (3.10) were also obtained by Inagaki and Fukuyama [19]. Thus our bosonized expression for the spin Hamiltonian (2.2) is equation (3.1) with equations (3.3) and (3.10). We note that this is valid for $|\delta_\perp| \ll 1$, $|\delta_z| \ll 1$ and $\epsilon \ll 1$.

To discuss the critical properties of the Haldane-LD transition, we apply the self-consistent harmonic approximation (SCHA), which is essentially the variational method, to the bosonized Hamiltonian (3.1) when $\delta_\perp < 0$ and $\delta_z > 0$. In the Haldane state, as is discussed in §2, the effect of δ_z is predominant and the average value of θ with respect to the ground-state, $\langle \theta \rangle$, is

$$\langle \theta \rangle = 0 , \quad (\text{Haldane state}), \quad (3.11)$$

so that the B_z term gains the energy. In the LD state, on the other hand, the effect of δ_z is predominant and

$$\langle \theta \rangle = \pi , \quad (\text{LD state}). \quad (3.12)$$

Then we set the SCHA Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_S = 2J_0 \int dx \{ A(\nabla\phi)^2 + CP^2 + \tilde{B}\phi^2 \} , \quad (3.13)$$

with

$$\phi \equiv \begin{cases} \theta , & (\text{Haldane state}) \\ \theta - \pi , & (\text{LD state}) \end{cases} , \quad (3.14)$$

where $\tilde{B}$ is the variational parameter. The parameter $\tilde{B}$ should be determined so that $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \rangle_S$ is minimized, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial \langle \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \rangle_S}{\partial \tilde{B}} = 0 , \quad (3.15)$$

where $\langle \cdots \rangle_S$ denotes the average with respect to the ground-state of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_S$.

The excitation spectrum of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_S$ is

$$\omega_S(q) = v\sqrt{q^2 + q_c^2} , \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$q_c^2 \equiv \tilde{B}/A . \quad (3.17)$$

and vq_c is the excitation gap. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_S$ is harmonic, the relations

$$\langle \exp(iu\phi) \rangle_S = \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2} \langle \phi^2 \rangle_S\right) , \quad (3.18)$$

$$\langle (\nabla\phi)^2 \cos\phi \rangle_S = \langle (\nabla\phi)^2 \rangle_S \langle \cos\phi \rangle_S , \quad (3.19)$$

hold with u being a real number. The average $\langle (\nabla\theta)^2 \rangle_S$ is

$$\langle (\nabla\theta)^2 \rangle_S = \frac{C}{L} \sum_q \frac{q^2}{\omega_S(q)} = \frac{\eta}{2} Q , \quad (3.20)$$

$$Q \equiv \int_0^{\alpha_0^{-1}} \frac{q^2 dq}{\sqrt{q^2 + q_c^2}} \simeq \frac{1}{\alpha_0^2} , \quad (\alpha_0 q_c \ll 1) , \quad (3.21)$$

where L is the system length, and the upper cutoff of the q -summation is denoted by α_0^{-1} which may be proportional to a^{-1} . Luther and Peschel [20] suggested $\pi\alpha_0 = a$. However, care must be taken to estimate Q , because equation (3.20) is strongly dependent on Q . Let us consider the $\Delta = 1$ (i.e., $\eta = 1$) case. As discussed in §2, for $\Delta = 1$, the effect of $\delta_\perp$ and δ_z cancel out with each other when equation (2.6) holds. Here we estimate so that the equation

$$\langle B_\perp \cos\theta + B_z (\nabla\theta)^2 \cos\theta \rangle_S = 0 , \quad (3.22)$$

reproduces equation (2.6) when $\Delta = 1$, which yields

$$Q = \pi/a^2 . \quad (3.23)$$

After some calculations, for the Haldane state, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \langle \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_b \rangle_S}{\partial \tilde{B}} = & L \left\{ \frac{B_\perp}{2} \exp \left(-\frac{\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S}{2} \right) + \frac{B_z}{2} \exp \left(-\frac{\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S}{2} \right) \langle (\nabla \phi)^2 \rangle_S - \tilde{B} \right\} \frac{\partial \langle \phi^2 \rangle_S}{\partial \tilde{B}} \\ & - L B_z \exp \left(-\frac{\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S}{2} \right) \frac{\partial \langle (\nabla \phi)^2 \rangle_S}{\partial \tilde{B}} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

The second term of the rhs of equation (3.24) can be dropped, because $\langle (\nabla \phi)^2 \rangle_S$ is almost independent of $\tilde{B}$, as can be seen equations (3.20) and (3.21). Then, equation (3.15) with equation (3.24) is reduced to

$$\tilde{B} = \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-\frac{\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S}{2} \right) \left(B_\perp + \frac{\pi \eta}{2a^2} B_z \right) . \quad (3.25)$$

The quantity $\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S$ is estimated as

$$\langle \phi^2 \rangle_S = \frac{C}{L} \sum_q \frac{1}{\omega_S(q)} = \eta \log \frac{2\pi}{aq_c} , \quad (aq_c \ll 1), \quad (3.26)$$

which leads to the self-consistent gap equation

$$Aq_c^2 = \frac{1}{2a} \left(\frac{aq_c}{2\pi} \right)^{\eta/2} \left(\delta_\perp + \frac{\eta}{2} \delta_z \right) . \quad (3.27)$$

Similar calculation can be performed for the LD state. If we replace $\delta_\perp + (\eta/2) \delta_z$ in equation (3.27) by $|\delta_\perp + (\eta/2) \delta_z|$, the gap equation becomes valid both for the Haldane state and for the LD state. Thus the excitation gap behaves as

$$\epsilon_{\text{gap}} = vq_c \sim \left| \delta_\perp + \frac{\eta}{2} \delta_z \right|^{2/(4-\eta)} . \quad (3.28)$$

The Haldane-LD phase boundary can be obtained from $\epsilon_{\text{gap}} = 0$, which leads to

$$2(1 - |\tilde{J}'|) + (1 - \tilde{D} + |\tilde{J}'|) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2|\tilde{J}'| - \tilde{D}}{1 + |\tilde{J}'|}} \right) = 0 . \quad (3.29)$$

where equations (2.3), (3.3) and (3.9) are employed. Okamoto, Nishino and Saika [10] have already obtained this phase boundary equation, compared it with Hida's numerical result [8] and discussed its validity.

If the critical value of D is denoted by D_c when $|J'|$ is fixed, we can rewrite equation (3.28) as

$$\epsilon_{\text{gap}} \sim |D - D_c|^\nu , \quad (3.30)$$

$$\nu = \frac{2}{4 - \eta} . \quad (3.31)$$

Thus we obtain

$$\nu_H = \nu_{LD} = \nu , \quad (3.32)$$

where ν_H (ν_{LD}) is the critical exponent of the excitation gap when the Haldane-LD boundary is approached from the Haldane (LD) phase.

The calculation of the longitudinal spin correlation $\langle S_j^z S_l^z \rangle$ by the use of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_S$ has been already done by the present author [21]. Here we only write down the final expression for $\langle S_j^z S_l^z \rangle$, without entering into details;

$$\langle S_j^z S_l^z \rangle \sim \frac{(-1)^{|j-l|}}{\sqrt{|j-l|}} \exp \left(-\frac{|j-l|a}{\xi} \right) , \quad (|j-l| \rightarrow \infty) , \quad (3.33)$$

where ξ is the correlation length defined by

$$\xi = \frac{v}{\epsilon_{\text{gap}}} \sim \left| \delta_{\perp} + \frac{\eta}{2} \delta_z \right|^{-\nu} \sim |D - D_c|^{-\nu} . \quad (3.34)$$

Thus ν is also the exponent of the correlation length as expected. Comparing the result of reference [21] with the exact result for the XY case [22], we may rely on the exponential factor in equation (3.33), although the preceding power factor is not reliable.

Hida [8] proposed the string order parameters for the Haldane phase and the LD phase. In the $\tilde{S}$ representation, these string order parameters are defined by

$$O_{\text{H}}^{\alpha} = \lim_{|j-l| \rightarrow \infty} O_{\text{H}}^{\alpha}(j-l) , \quad (3.35)$$

$$O_{\text{LD}}^{\alpha} = \lim_{|j-l| \rightarrow \infty} O_{\text{LD}}^{\alpha}(j-l) , \quad (3.36)$$

with

$$O_{\text{H}}^{\alpha}(j-l) = -4 \langle \tilde{S}_{2j}^{\alpha} \exp\{i\pi(\tilde{S}_{2j+1}^{\alpha} + \tilde{S}_{2j+2}^{\alpha} + \cdots + \tilde{S}_{2l-2}^{\alpha})\} \tilde{S}_{2l-1}^{\alpha} \rangle , \quad (3.37)$$

$$O_{\text{LD}}^{\alpha}(j-l) = -4 \langle \tilde{S}_{2j-1}^{\alpha} \exp\{i\pi(\tilde{S}_{2j}^{\alpha} + \tilde{S}_{2j+1}^{\alpha} + \cdots + \tilde{S}_{2l-1}^{\alpha})\} \tilde{S}_{2l}^{\alpha} \rangle , \quad (3.38)$$

$$\alpha = x, y, z . \quad (3.39)$$

By the use of the identity $S_j^z = \exp(i\tilde{S}_j^z)/2i$ valid for the spin-1/2 operators, we can rewrite equations (3.37) and (3.38) as

$$O_{\text{H}}^z(j-l) = \langle \exp\{i\pi(\tilde{S}_{2j}^z + \tilde{S}_{2j+1}^z + \cdots + \tilde{S}_{2l-1}^z)\} \rangle , \quad (3.40)$$

$$O_{\text{LD}}^z(j-l) = \langle \exp\{i\pi(\tilde{S}_{2j-1}^z + \tilde{S}_{2j}^z + \cdots + \tilde{S}_{2l}^z)\} \rangle , \quad (3.41)$$

respectively. Since the slowly varying part of the z -component of the spin density is expressed as $(1/2\pi) (\partial\theta/\partial x)$, the boson representations of $O_{\text{H}}^z(j-l)$ and $O_{\text{LD}}^z(j-l)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} O_{\text{H}}^z(x-x') &= O_{\text{LD}}^z(x-x') \\ &= \langle \exp\{i[\theta(x) - \theta(x')]/2\} \rangle \\ &= \langle \exp\{i[\phi(x) - \phi(x')]/2\} \rangle \\ &\equiv O^z(x-x') . \end{aligned} \quad (3.42)$$

We note that the difference between the $O_{\text{H}}^z(x-x')$ and $O_{\text{LD}}^z(x-x')$ is lost due to the continuum approximation used in the bosonization method.

Let us calculate O^z in the framework of the SCHA. Due to the harmonic nature of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{S}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} O^z(x-x') &= \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{8} \langle [\theta(x) - \theta(x')]^2 \rangle_{\text{S}} \right\} \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} \langle \phi^2 \rangle_{\text{S}} \right) \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \langle \phi(x) \phi(x') \rangle_{\text{S}} \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

The average $\langle \phi(x) \phi(x') \rangle_{\text{S}}$ is estimated as [21]

$$\langle \phi(x) \phi(x') \rangle_{\text{S}} = \frac{C}{\pi v} K_0(q_c[|x-x'| + \alpha_1]) , \quad (3.44)$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{ae^{-\gamma}}{\pi} , \quad \gamma = 0.5772 \cdots \quad (\text{Euler's constant}) , \quad (3.45)$$

where $K_n(y)$ is the n -th order modified Bessel function of the second kind. We note that the parameter α_1 is determined so that equation (3.26) is reproduced when $|x-x'| = 0$. Using the asymptotic behavior of $K_0(y)$

$$K_0(y) \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2y}} e^{-y} , \quad (y \rightarrow \infty) , \quad (3.46)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} O^z &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\langle\phi^2\rangle_S\right) \\ &\sim q_c^{\eta/4} \sim |D - D_c|^{\eta/(8-2\eta)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

If we denote the exponents of O_H^z and O_{LD}^z by $2\beta_H^z$ and $2\beta_{LD}^z$ respectively (for the factor 2, we follow Hida's definition [8], we see

$$\beta_H = \beta_{LD} = \frac{\eta}{16 - 4\eta} \equiv \beta . \quad (3.48)$$

We can also calculate the asymptotic behavior of $O^z(x - x')$ when $|x - x'| \rightarrow \infty$ just on the Haldane-LD boundary. Using equations (3.43)-(3.45) and taking the limit $q_c \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$O^z(x - x')|_{D=D_c} \sim |x - x'|^{-\eta/4} , \quad (3.49)$$

where the asymptotic form

$$K_0(y) \simeq -\log y , \quad (y \rightarrow 0) , \quad (3.50)$$

is employed. Hida [8] also numerically calculated the system size dependence of O_H^z and O_{LD}^z on the Haldane-LD boundary. He defined

$$O_H^z(N)|_{D=D_c} \sim N^{-\mu_H} , \quad (3.51)$$

$$O_{LD}^z(N)|_{D=D_c} \sim N^{-\mu_{LD}} , \quad (3.52)$$

where N is the system size. Although Hida [8] used η^z for this exponents, we use μ to avoid confusion. From equation (3.49), we can expect

$$\mu_H = \mu_{LD} = \frac{\eta}{4} \equiv \mu . \quad (3.53)$$

This result can also obtained from the finite size scaling ansatz

$$O^z(|D - D_c|, N) \sim N^{-\mu} f(N|D - D_c|^\nu) , \quad (3.54)$$

where we note that $N/\xi \sim N|D - D_c|^\nu$. The form of equation (3.54) is chosen so that equations (3.51) and (3.52) are reproduced at $D = D_c$. If we fix $|D - D_c|$ and take the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$f(x) \sim x^\mu , \quad (x \rightarrow \infty) , \quad (3.55)$$

$$O^z(|D - D_c|, N = \infty) \sim |D - D_c|^{\mu\nu} , \quad (3.56)$$

from the condition that $O^z(|D - D_c|, N)$ should be independent of N when $N \rightarrow \infty$. From equations (3.47) and (3.48) it follows that

$$\mu\nu = 2\beta , \quad (3.57)$$

which readily leads to equation (3.53). The relation (3.57) was also noticed by Hida [8].

§4. Discussion

We have calculated several critical exponents of the Haldane-LD transition. These exponents are controlled by ν , which varies continuously on the Haldane-LD boundary. Thus the present transition is of the Gaussian universality class. This fact has been already pointed out by several groups [8-10].

In this paper we have used the mapping of the original spin Hamiltonian onto the generalized version of the sine-Gordon Hamiltonian. Since several approximation have been used in the course of the mapping, the values of D_c and the critical exponent themselves are unreliable. We believe, however, that the present

theory well describes the qualitative feature of the Haldane-LD transition. From equations (3.31), (3.48) and (3.53), our prediction for the relations between critical exponents are

$$\nu_{\text{H}} = \nu_{\text{LD}} = \nu , \quad (4.1)$$

$$\beta_{\text{H}} = \beta_{\text{LD}} = \beta = \frac{2\nu - 1}{4} , \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mu_{\text{H}} = \mu_{\text{LD}} = \mu = 1 - \frac{1}{2\nu} . \quad (4.3)$$

The reliability of the present theory can be examined by testing whether equations (4.2) and (4.3) hold or not in Hida's numerical result [8,23]. This test is summarized in Table I, where the exponents ν , β_{H} , β_{LD} , μ_{H} and μ_{LD} are numerical results by Hida and β_{theor} and μ_{theor} are calculated from Hida's ν through equations (4.2) and (4.3). As can be seen, the values of β_{theor} and μ_{theor} very well agree with β_{H} and β_{LD} , and μ_{H} and μ_{LD} , respectively. Therefore we can say that our theory successfully describes the qualitative feature of the Haldane-LD transition.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to K. Hida for useful discussions and providing me his numerical data. I also thank K. Nomura, Y. Saika and D. Nishino for stimulating discussions.

References

- [1] Haldane F D M 1983 *Phys. Lett.* **93A** 464.
- [2] Haldane F D M 1983 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** 1153.
- [3] Hida K 1992 *Phys. Rev. B* **45** 2207.
- [4] Hida K 1992 *Phys. Rev. B* **46** 8268.
- [5] Hida K 1993 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **62** 1463.
- [6] Kohmoto M and Tasaki H 1992 *Phys. Rev. B* **46** 3486.
- [7] Takada S 1992 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **61** 428.
- [8] Hida K 1993 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **62** 1466.
- [9] Yamanaka M, Hatsugai Y and Kohmoto M 1993 *Phys. Rev. B* **48** 9555.
- [10] Okamoto K, Nishino D and Saika Y 1993 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **62** 2587.
- [11] Okamoto K 1992 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **61** 3488.
- [12] Okamoto K and Nishino D 1993 *Solid State Commun.* **85** 343.
- [13] Black J L and Emery V J 1981 *Phys. Rev. B* **23** 429.
- [14] Nakano T and Fukuyama H 1981 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **50** 2489.
- [15] des Cloizeaux J and Gaudin M 1966 *J. Math. Phys.* **7** 1384.
- [16] Johnson J D, Krinsky S and McCoy B 1973 *Phys. Rev A* **8** 2526.
- [17] Cross M C and Fisher D S 1979 *Phys. Rev. B* **19** 402.
- [18] Nakano T and Fukuyama H 1981 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **49** 1679.
- [19] Inagaki S and Fukuyama H 1983 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **52** 2504.
- [20] Luther A and Peschel I 1975 *Phys. Rev. B* **12** 3908.
- [21] Okamoto K 1987 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **56** 912.
- [22] Okamoto K 1988 *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **57** 1988.
- [23] Hida K: private communications.

Figure Captions:

Fig.1 Important parameters in Hamiltonian (2.2) on the $|\tilde{J}'| - \tilde{D}$ plane. The transverse and longitudinal alternations are mutually competing in the shadowed areas. The point S ($|\tilde{J}'| = 1, \tilde{D} = 2$) corresponds to the uniform isotropic antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model.